

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 34, 60, 86, 112, 138 and 139 are amended, and new claim 157 is added. Accordingly, Claims 34-157 are pending in this application. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiners are thanked for the many courtesies extended to Applicant's attorney in the course of a personal interview conducted March 10, 2004. The substance of the interview is included herein per MPEP §713.04.

I. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 34-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter, because these claims do not indicate that they are implemented by a computing device. The independent method claims 34, 60, 86, and 112 are amended to recite that the method claims are "implemented by a computing device." Further, apparatus claim 138 is amended to recite, "the relation matrix generator and display matrix generator are implemented by a computer system, and the first and second input devices are coupled to the computer system." Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 34-159 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because the invention as a whole does not accomplish a practical application and produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent method claims 34, 60, 86, and 112 are implemented by a computing device and independent apparatus claim 138 has a relation matrix generator and display matrix generator implemented by a computer system. In addition, independent claims 140, 142 and 146 relate to a computer program product, and independent claims 148, 150, 152 and 154 relate to a computer program data signal embodied in a telecommunications medium.

For example, method claims 34, 60, 86, and 112 recite:

obtaining relationship information of all possible pairs of said [inputted] items, based on perception of said subject with respect to relationship between two items of each of said all possible pairs of said items;
generating a relation matrix of the plurality of items...;
transforming said relation matrix to a display matrix projected on a representation space...; and
displaying said items ... according to said display matrix such that said items are plotted on respective positions in said representation space and shown on an output device,"

One of the many useful, concrete and tangible results of one of the exemplary methods of the present invention is that an individual who inputted the items can recognize the essential gist of his or her thoughts that may not have been perceived by himself or herself by observing the positions of the items shown on the output device (paragraph bridging pages 43-44 of the specification). Accordingly, the invention as a whole does accomplish a practical application and produce useful, concrete, and tangible results.

Further, apparatus claim 138 recites:

An analyzing apparatus..., comprising:
...a relation matrix generator adapted to generate a relation matrix based on said relationship information of each of said items with respect to the others of said items;
a display matrix generator adapted to transform said relation matrix into said display matrix projected on a representation space...;
a display device adapted to display said items in said representation space such that said items are plotted on respective positions in said representation according to said display matrix; and
an external display device being arranged for visually showing said representation space in the form of two or three dimensional coordinates in which said items are plotted in the respective coordinates...

One of the many useful, concrete and tangible results of the analyzing apparatus of the exemplary embodiment of the present invention is that an individual who inputted the items can recognize the essential gist of his or her thoughts that may not have been perceived by himself or herself by observing the positions of the items shown on the external display

device (paragraph bridging pages 43-44 of the specification). Accordingly, the invention as a whole does accomplish a practical application and produce useful, concrete, and tangible results.

Computer program product claims 140, 142, and 146 recite:

- computer code that relates each of said items to all other items, using a rating of relationship on several levels;
- computer code that generate a relation matrix using said obtained relation ratings;
- computer code that performs a multivariate analysis on said relation matrix so as to transform said relation matrix to a display matrix;
- computer code that display the all items on respective position of a representation space...

One of the many useful, concrete and tangible results of the computer program products of the present invention is that an individual can recognize the essential gist of his or her thoughts that may not have been perceived by himself or herself by observing the positions of the items that are displayed (paragraph bridging pages 43-44 of the specification). Accordingly, the invention as a whole does accomplish a practical application and produce useful, concrete, and tangible results.

Finally, computer program data signal claims 148, 150, 152, and 154 recite:

- ...computer program data signal embodied in a telecommunications medium...cause the processor to perform the steps of:...
- obtaining relationship information of all possible pairs of said items...;
- generating a relation matrix of said plurality of items based on said relation information of each of said items with respect to said all other items;
- transforming the relation matrix to a display matrix projected on a representation space...; and
- displaying said items on said representation space according to said display matrix ...

One of the many useful, concrete and tangible results of the computer program data signal claims of the present invention is that an individual can recognize the essential gist of his or her thoughts that may not have been perceived by himself or herself by observing the positions of the items that are displayed (paragraph bridging pages 43-44 of the specification).

Accordingly, the invention as a whole does accomplish a practical application and produce useful, concrete, and tangible results.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 34, 60, 86, 112, 140, 142, 146, 148, 150, 152 and 154 are directed to statutory subject matter and fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. The remainder of the claims that depend from independent claims 34, 60, 86, 112, 140, 142, 146, 148, 150, 152 and 154 likewise fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 34-156 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the application fails to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. As discussed above, claims 34-156 satisfy the 35 U.S.C. §101 requirements. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

III. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 34-156 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts, "[s]pecifically, the claims employed the language '...obtaining a plurality of items perceived by said subject;...' What does this mean? ..." Applicant has amended claim 34 to recite "inputting a plurality of items perceived by said subject in to the computing device" to obviate this rejection.

In addition, the Office Action also appears to assert that other claim language is also vague and indefinite. However, the Office Action does not identify any other claim language as being vague and indefinite.


Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action and respectfully asserts that claims 34-156 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 34-157 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

JAO:PFD/can

Date: April 29, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--